



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IS THE GOTHIC BIBLE GOTHIC?

Every distinguished Germanic linguist has expressed himself on the question now before us. A long list of small fry have, in learned articles and dissertations, given their decisions on this or that phase of the general subject. The question is too important to remain unsolved. Some day we shall know. The present writer enters upon the difficult task of discussing this problem only after considerable hesitation, and yet with quiet assurance, for he brings with him a handful of facts. This question will be settled when the last fact is in. Glittering generalities, polemic zeal, oratorical power will not avail here. Many beautiful things have been said about Wulfila's language, and many sharp depreciatory remarks have been made, but the question is still an open one. Also penetrating scholarship has not yet dispelled the darkness, but the only hope is from this direction. This contribution is not the work of a definite period. It represents the accretion of many years, often interrupted by studies in other Germanic languages and other periods. The strength gained from labor in other linguistic fields has time and again been placed in the service of the study of Gothic problems. In the course of the last thirty years the writer has changed his views radically on this subject, little by little as the facts came to light. For years the fruits of these studies have lain in rough, unfinished shape, unpublished, as the fear was ever present that new developments might appear and a new change of feeling might throw a new light upon the gathered materials. Now as a quiet and permanent peace seems to have come and renewed work on the old collected materials has brought a comforting assurance and has strengthened conviction, the desire arises to give these studies to the public. In them lie not only the results of long years of patient toil after the plodding manner of German scholarship, but also the evident signs of a strong *feeling*, which has never been entirely suppressed by the scientific critical sense, as it has often proved itself to be a

valuable collateral source of information. Impelled by some strong, mystic force this feeling has always sought to penetrate beneath the surface and outward appearance of things. While the intellect tried to grasp logical forces and grammatical law, it tried to comprehend the whole by *feeling* it. Thus in the course of these studies many attempts have been made to *feel* the way to the meaning of the Gothic forms just as we feel our way into the riches of a modern masterpiece. Just as in life feeling alone places us into the real possession of what we own and alone makes clear their values, so it is often true in language that feeling alone reveals the absolute values of linguistic forms. A German scholar has observed that the reflexive usually follows the verb immediately in Gothic wherever the Gothic deviates from the Greek original, and is found in other positions only where the Gothic follows the Greek. He comes to the conclusion that when the Gothic reflexive stands apart from the verb it must be a Greek construction. He forgot to *feel* the sentence. The reflexive took its position in Gothic, according to its logical and emotional value. It is usually the most unimportant word in the sentence and hence stands in the least stressed position. Much of this has been preserved in modern German. In the subordinate clause the reflexive follows the subject, and thus stands in the most unimportant place. The verb, however, stands at the end of the subordinate clause as far away from the reflexive as possible. In the principal proposition the reflexive follows the verb immediately, and thus again stands in the least stressed place in the sentence. The position of the reflexive is consistent in both principal and subordinate clauses. It is the verb that has changed its position, not the reflexive. When the Gothic reflexive thus stood apart from the verb it followed not Greek law, but a general law, deep-seated in natural feeling. It is found in German as well as in Greek and Gothic. The writer has in the last years often lost his patience over the modern trend that *mechanically* observes positions, counts grammatical forms, and makes long and intricate tables without *feeling* the *value* of things, and yet this plodding fashion is after all the only true

method of investigation. We must, however, take a lively *feeling* with us into this dry and laborious statistical work lest we become mere hod-carriers who carry dead materials, perfectly useless unless they should perchance fall into hands that could use them. In principle, however, we are perfectly in sympathy with the scientific plodding method, and it will be necessary in the course of this article to enter into the study of the minute details of the development of forms and meanings. Before presenting these matters we shall give a brief general outline of the question as a whole for the benefit of those who do not desire to go into the study of the details. To the linguist, however, nothing will be convincing but the details themselves. As this paper is directed to two different classes of readers and is divided into two different parts, one general, the other detailed, there will be some unavoidable repetitions in the second part containing the detailed treatment.

An interesting history of the shifting views of the merits of Wulfila's work has been written by Hans Stolzenburg in "*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*," Vol. 37. This brings the account down to 1905. The question has by no means rested since this date. In books and dissertations learned philologists continue to find an opportunity to say something on this question and have not infrequently contributed valuable facts. There does not seem to be the faintest indication that the opinions are converging. It is remarkable that among so many brilliant scholars there could be such wide divergence of views. On the one hand, Castiglione, whose penetrating examination of Gothic readings in manuscript form has contributed so much to our knowledge of the true Gothic form, has said: "*Ita ut in ulphilano libro græcum habeas textum gothicis quidem vocabulis con-vestitum, borealibus tamen idiotismis plane carentem.*" If this annihilating criticism were true there would be no need of our studying Gothic to learn from it something of the syntactical structure of the oldest Germanic language. Castiglione meant his criticism kindly, because he saw in Wulfila's procedure a worthy attempt of a holy man to preserve unchanged the sacred

word of God, but his conclusion was so disastrous to the hopes of scholars and so many precious interests were involved that it could not satisfy linguists. Thus, on the other hand, scholars arose to defend the Gothic quality of Wulfila's language. Some of these praise in the strongest terms both the language and the style of Wulfila's translation. It is easy to explain why some of these views are full of admiration for Wulfila's work. Everyone who has studied the Gothic Bible carefully and in a favorable attitude has been greatly impressed with the accurate and skillful rendering of certain difficult places. One scholar calls attention to the adroit translation of the Greek future with the scanty means at hand, scanty because there is in Gothic no future. Another praises his discriminate use of the moods which sometimes shows finer shades of meaning than the original. Another says he always endeavors to reproduce faithfully the thought and that at times his expression seems to unfold the deeper meaning more perfectly than the Greek. Another calls attention to his fine style enlivened by alliteration and poetic feeling, while another points to his choice selection of words, to avoid the repetition of the same word as found in the original. Another calls attention to his close touch with his people, as shown by his reckoning time by winters, according to Gothic custom. Another calls attention to his translation of the Greek superlative by the comparative, where the meaning points to two, or the rendering of a Greek comparative by a superlative, where the context points to more than two, or the use of the comparative instead of the Greek positive, where there is an evident reference to two. The Goth did not always stand in holy awe of the careless expressions of popular New Testament Greek. If all the observations upon Wulfila's linguistic skill were gathered together from the rich literature on this subject, there would be quite a list of good qualities to his credit. Some of these things may be exaggerated, some of them ought to be ascribed to the natural richness of the Gothic language, some of them can only be ascribed to sharp observation and real linguistic power. It is hard for an admirer of Wulfila to believe

that one can be a sharp observer gifted with a keen sense for fine shades of meaning and beautiful form and at the same time be a slavish translator. On the other hand, for one who has observed that the word-order in Gothic is often page after page exactly like the Greek, it is hard to believe that this is idiomatic speech. Of course, the word-order is often quite different in places, but the suspicion arises that these are points where the two languages are so radically different that even a slavish translator has to pay some consideration to his own idiom if he desires to be understood. A real insight into the actual situation can never be gained as long as one studies the question in such a general vague way. The laws that regulate word-order must be studied in a minute, scientific fashion, such as is given below in detail. From this investigation it becomes apparent that thought and feeling and a sense for rhythm have a large part in assigning words their positions in the sentence. As Wulfila endeavored earnestly and consistently to reproduce fully and accurately the thought and feeling of the original, the Gothic word-order naturally of itself conformed quite closely to that of the popular Greek of the New Testament, for the psychological and rhythmical laws of the two languages were at that time almost identical. This is to the writer the most important observation that he has ever made. Scarcely less interesting and important is the simple fact that these old psychological and rhythmical laws are still largely in force. In modern German the important words stand in the first place or the last one. The least important word follows the subject in the subordinate clause and the verb in the principal proposition, and from these positions on toward the end of the sentence the words become more forcibly stressed, so that the heavier words, i. e., those heavier by virtue of their psychological force, or their material weight, gravitate toward the end. Exactly the same laws obtained in Gothic and New Testament Greek. These laws have in all these years not changed in the slightest degree. The full operation of the laws has, however, in large measure been impeded in the modern languages by the development of formal grammatical or functional

laws. For instance, in German the verb must now stand at the end in subordinate clauses. The object of the infinitive must precede it. The perfect participle and infinitive must stand at the end of the proposition, whether they are emphatic or not. This is the survival of an older order of things which is no longer felt or understood. It is now a mere formal or functional law. In English these particular formal laws have not developed at all, but we have others that have arisen thru the loss of inflection. In English, the loss of the case forms necessitates the use of prepositional phrases and these heavier forms in replacing lighter ones have brought about a different word-order in many cases, for the same old rhythmical laws still obtain and require the heavier forms to follow lighter ones. Thus the old psychological and rhythmical laws still remain unchanged, but the development of fixed formal laws often suspend the operation of these laws. They assert themselves, however, whenever they are not impeded by formal forces. Thus formal laws change in every language from period to period, but the simple psychological and rhythmical laws remain unaltered. It is not strange that the psychological and rhythmical laws were identical in New Testament Greek and Gothic, but that the two languages have also almost the same formal or functional laws attracts at first our attention. Before we discover that the laws here are almost the same it seems at first that it is mere slavish imitation that made Wulfila's word-order almost exactly like that of the New Testament Greek. In fact, however, the laws in the two languages coincide. They were both in the same state of historical development. We need not be content here with this glittering generality. The testimony of the older Germanic languages is to be had. In the firm belief that a minute comparative study of the older Germanic formal laws and formal types and their historical development will establish the Gothic and Germanic quality of Wulfila's word-order, the writer has devoted his best strength to this work and gives below the results of his studies in outline. Of course, these materials could not be presented in full here, but at important vital points minute

details have been given. These details will bring to others the same conviction that has come to the writer, that the Gothic quality of Wulfila's word-order is now beyond question. It can be proved by the testimony of the kindred languages. The word order is undoubtedly good Gothic, but it is not Wulfila's word-order. It is the word-order of the Greek Testament which Wulfila tried so hard to reproduce faithfully and as completely as was compatible with the fixed formal laws in his own native language, which at some points restrained him, for in spite of the great similarity of the formal laws in the two languages there were some differences. Wulfila preached in both Gothic and Greek. Both languages were living forces to him. The change of the word-order shifted the emphasis and altered the thought. He could feel such things very easily, for he could feel in both languages. He had no desire to hand down to modern philologists an individual Gothic, a Wulfilian Gothic. He was translating the word of God, and he felt it his simple duty to hand it down as completely as he could, i. e., with the warm human accents of the original. The warm human accents lie in the word-order. Because this Gothic is not individual Wulfilian it is not the less good Gothic. We have here to do with the individual stamp that is put upon language. The language of Goethe and that of Schiller have each quite a distinct individual stamp, but in each case it is good German. A close study of Wulfila's word-order shows that some of his own feeling has crept into his translation, but in general the distribution of accents is that of the original, but always good Gothic or as good as he could make it. Wulfila performed his work much better than our honored and revered Castiglione imagined that he did. He not only handed down the form of the original, but also its thought and feeling. The present writer differs from other scholars who have discussed this question in that he thinks that *Wulfila did not hand down to us the form unchanged in order to preserve the form. He preserved the form because the form contained the thought and feeling of the animated original.* The preservation of the form was largely unconscious. It was

unconscious in its deepest and best portions. We have so many little indications in the language itself that Wulfila was consciously trying to reproduce the feeling of the original by the same distribution of emphasis. We know that Wulfila was here not mechanically following the Greek order, but was consciously striving to reproduce definite accents by the fact that at times he uses little rhetorical tricks to heighten the emphasis. This point will be illustrated in detail below. Even where Wulfila followed the Greek so closely as to reproduce anacoluthons of the Greek original we plainly see that he *felt* the language. In these passages the energy of the tone and the vividness of the feeling are especially apparent. Here, again, the form contained the thought and feeling. That he was endeavoring to reproduce thought and feeling and not the form also becomes evident where not satisfied with the emphasis of the original he deviates from the Greek order to place the emphasis where he thinks it properly belongs. Some of these deviations are very interesting and show how vividly Wulfila felt the meaning of the original and how faithfully he translated it. In general, the Greek original gave him little occasion to supply additional accents. The language of the Greek Testament is plain, popular speech, not the learned expression of scholars. It fairly abounds in simple but forcible accents, such as naturally arise in animated language. Wulfila only followed the natural instinct of a preacher in keeping close to this animated original. That Wulfila could thus preserve the form with such wonderful fidelity is simply the result of the similarity of the development of the two languages. The feat can never be performed again. The feat is a wonder from our point of view, it was from the viewpoint of Wulfila's time simply a fine piece of work. The writer hasn't the slightest desire to lionize Wulfila. After a long and minute study of the Gothic Bible he is convinced that the translation is a good one, good because it preserves the *thought* and the *feeling* of the original. The writer cannot understand how anyone can study this translation carefully without coming to the conclusion that it is *spoken* language. This is shown by the position of the

words, not only where they conform to the Greek, but where the order differs markedly from the original. The whole work is punctuated by human accents, which give clear evidence of lively feeling. In one place Wulfila has even observed and skilfully rendered an expression of keen sarcasm.

In recent years the study of Gothic has entered a rather new stage. Conspicuous scholars such as Kauffmann and v. Soden have devoted their best energies to ascertain the exact Greek text that Wulfila used as a basis for his translation. Professor Streitberg has made much of this work accessible to us by publishing the Gothic Bible with the Gothic text on the one side and the Greek text on the other. The variant readings of different Latin and Greek texts are given below where they seem to have a bearing on the Gothic text. This edition ought to be on every Germanic scholar's desk. No one appreciates the value of this fine edition more than the writer, who has used it daily since its first appearance in 1908, but he is nevertheless dissatisfied with its spirit and its results. This book is connected with a series of learned efforts to direct attention to the Greek text more than it deserves. Professor Streitberg says in the preface of his Gothic Bible: "Ich stimme Fr. Kauffmann darin bei, dass die gotischen Sprachreste ohne die Quellen unverständlich sind." This is such a gross exaggeration that it is unworthy of the fine scholars that are associated with the statement. This opinion represents the view of those who in studying the details have overlooked the main question. The general truth is that Wulfila's Gothic text is a plain and forceful translation that is perfectly clear in its own light without the help of the Greek original. As will be made clear below in considerable detail we cannot safely use the Greek to test the Gothic quality of Wulfila's speech. In one respect, however, the comparison of the Gothic with the Greek brings fruitful results. From learned investigation it has become apparent that the Gothic text has been tampered with. Gothic scholars have altered it by introducing into one gospel the parallel readings of another gospel, so as to bring about a conformity of text. Marginal notes have crept into the text and have

become an integral part of it. These inserted words and phrases are usually good Gothic. Their removal from the text is not in the interest of purifying the quality of the Gothic, but to allow us to judge clearly of Wulfila's work as a translator. The minute study of the exact Greek text that Wulfila used is very helpful in enabling us to remove all the insertions and to look at Wulfila's text just as he wrote it. Thus the use of the Greek text does not throw any light at all upon the meaning of the Gothic. We simply use it to distinguish Wulfila's work from that of others. On the other hand, these Gothic insertions are of themselves interesting, for they constitute valuable additions to our meager stock of Gothic words. In the case of the underlined adjective in the following passage the interpolation throws valuable light upon the historic development of the language in the period subsequent to the translation of the Bible: "ufarfullips im fahedais in allaizos *managons* aglons unsaraizos (2 Cor. 7.4)" I am filled with joy in all our manifold tribulation." In the time of Wulfila an adjective following *all* or a possessive was in the strong declension. Here we find it weak as the idea of individualization in the later Gothic period as in the later period of the other Germanic tongues received a formal expression in the language itself by the use of the weak declension. Thus these interpolations are not harmful in themselves. We only need to understand their true relation to the text of Wulfila. In other places the interpolations do not seem to be of so harmless a nature. In a *few* passages it seems possible that Gothic scholars have changed the text to bring it in conformity with the reading of some other Greek text or a Latin version. In some cases it seems as though these insertions were so carelessly framed that they have retained the grammatical structure of the Greek or Latin original. Of course, if this is true the case is serious enough, for nothing is so important in the entire realm of Germanic study as to know the exact structure of Gothic, the oldest Germanic language. The natural importance of the subject has spurred a number of scholars to investigate these foreign sources of corruption. Some of them in their zeal

have become possessed by the fixed idea that they have discovered sure traces of interpolation. In their heated imaginations they take similarity of grammatical structure between Gothic and Latin or Greek as a proof that the Gothic has been conformed to the Latin or Greek. Even if we accept all the conjectures that all these scholars offer we still have a fairly well-preserved Gothic text. We linguists really ought to rejoice that we have such a treasure of priceless value as the Gothic Bible. We ought to show our appreciation by a more profound study of the language that is preserved in it. This ought to become the *main* field of Gothic study, but some good may be gained by a careful study of the Greek original and the Latin texts. The writer even hopes that scholars will continue their search after interpolations. Some will be very happy in such fine scholarly work. Professor Streitberg, not entirely satiated by the large number of interpolations which he thinks he has already found, has inserted some more into the Gothic Bible on his own account, as he by dint of his vivid imagination has discovered that Wulfila has made some bad slips in his Gothic, and ought to be corrected. Not a stone should be left unturned until we discover the last interpolation and the last error in Wulfila's speech. When these scholars have developed their imaginations by such exhilarating exercise they ought to turn their efforts toward discovering *all* the passages where Wulfila imitated the Greek mechanically. After all these laborious and fruitful investigations we shall know just what is Gothic and what is Greek and Latin. Behind these enthusiastic discoverers will follow sober and calm linguists who will sift out the wild conjectures and carefully preserve the *few* golden grains of truth. We have today a fine text of Beowulf in the last edition of Professor Holthausen. Many of the wild conjectures will now soon be forgotten. Professor Holthausen, in harmony with a number of other sane thinkers, has directed his attention to trying to understand the text that has been handed down to us rather than to search for new conjectures. The result is that some of the most difficult passages have become perfectly clear in their own light without the help

of conjectures and emendations of the text. In Gothic study the efforts will some day be directed toward the study of the Gothic text rather than the Greek original. The present situation is not at all satisfactory. As long as our eyes are fixed only upon the Greek text the mind is confused by the great similarity and the feeling grows stronger that the Greek is the cause of all this similarity. Our eyes should also be directed toward the other Germanic languages. The minute scientific comparison of these languages with Gothic will be the most fruitful source of information on this subject. Once when the writer only studied the Greek he was sure that the Gothic word-order was a slavish imitation of the Greek. Now after a long and careful comparative study of other Germanic languages he is quietly and firmly convinced that no part of the Gothic Bible is more surely Gothic than its word-order. In the fine new edition of the Gothic Bible by Professor Streitberg the attention has been directed so fixedly at the Greek that the vision has been somewhat obscured. Doubtless many of the conjectures in this edition will disappear in a future edition. This edition, however, is quite symptomatic of the unhealthy state of Gothic scholarship at the present time. It is all the worse because the tendency represented in this book is also found elsewhere. It is a queer fact that in the history of Gothic study there has been at times an abrupt swing from one extreme to the other. It is to be hoped that it is now about time to return again to an *appreciative* study of Wulfila's language.

In the following more detailed study of our subject the attention is chiefly turned to those points where Gothic closely conforms to the Greek. It is now generally acknowledged that Wulfila has made some clever renderings, but there is still a general impression that a large part of his work follows the Greek so closely that it cannot be called idiomatic Gothic. It is the object of this treatise to show that Wulfila uniformly wrote idiomatic Gothic and that his language is just as good Gothic where it conforms closely to the Greek as where it deviates widely.

No part of Gothic syntax has suffered so continuously under

the suspicion of Greek and Latin influences as the Gothic word-order. The subject has already been discussed in the *Journal*. In Vol. I, page 147, Professor McKnight, in an article entitled "Primitive Teutonic Order of Words," has said: "For the study of word-order Wulfila is of little value, owing to the slavish way in which he followed the Greek order. . . . Although many of the Greek idioms belong also to Teutonic, and actually do occur in other ancient Teutonic monuments, it is absurd to assume between any two languages a natural similarity in word-order as striking as that between the Gothic translation of the Bible and the Greek original." This is a sweeping statement based upon general impressions rather than upon a close scientific study of the linguistic processes, by which Wulfila approached the Greek. A close conformity in word-order does not always indicate a slavish linguistic habit, but often a psychological attitude. From the testimony of his own work it is evident that Wulfila did everything in his power to approach the thought and feeling of the original as closely as possible. Thought and feeling not only lie in the choice of words, but also largely in their arrangement. The least disturbance of the word-order brings about a disturbance of the thought and feeling. Thus Wulfila naturally and perhaps unconsciously followed the Greek form, for in the form lay the thought and feeling that he was trying to reproduce. There are many little details connected with the system of arranging words in a language and most of these details are intimately connected with the thought and feeling. These things are of a psychological nature and lie largely outside of the domain of formal grammar and in Wulfila's language did not in any way injure the Gothic quality of his speech. This point has been misunderstood by some scholars, as nicely illustrated by a remark of Dr. Koppitz in "*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*," Vol. 32, page 462. Dr. Koppitz had just been depreciating some observations of Dr. Friedrichs upon Wulfila's arrangement of reflexive pronouns by the reflection that this arrangement of reflexives could scarcely be called Gothic, as the same order is found in the Greek. He then remarks: "Ich

glaube, dass Friedrichs durch diese Belege nur bewiesen hat, wie der Gote auch die Worte setzen konnte, nicht aber wie er nach echt gotischem Sprachgebrauch sie gezeugt hätte." Dr. Koppitz is here confounding grammar and style, form and psychology. As will be shown below, Wulfila's arrangement of reflexives is good Gothic in as far as it does not violate any formal rules of Gothic grammar. His language was idiomatic Gothic, but the thought and the feeling were not his own. He did his best to assume the psychological attitude of the Greek narrators and it was his duty to do this, for he was operating as a translator, but others often employed in their usual Gothic speech this same order to express the same thought and feeling. On the other hand, under slightly different impressions the order would have been altered. These things do not belong to formal grammar at all and do not at all affect the idiomatic quality of speech in so far as they do not come in conflict with fixed grammatical rules. In connection with this subject of the relation of grammar to style it is important to note that the time at which Wulfila wrote, i. e., the state of the development of his native language, is a mighty factor in the case. A High German writer a few centuries later would have found it impossible to do what was perfectly natural for Wulfila. On the other hand, English has had a development remarkably similar to that found in Gothic, so that the King James version of the English Bible shows in the word-order a general similarity to the Gothic and in places a striking resemblance. The writer, in imitating the procedure of Wulfila in trying to get up as close to the Greek as possible, has translated long Greek passages into idiomatic English, in which in places the English is very close to the original, in other places it is not so close. It would be possible to bring these latter passages nearer the Greek if we could employ the word-order of "Beowulf." Of course, Wulfila found it still easier and probably quite natural to follow the Greek original much nearer. Thus it is evident that the element of historical development here is very important. Another point of great interest is that the portions of the English translation that approach the

Greek the nearest are just as idiomatic English as those that are unlike the original. This shows how unscientific the usual German procedure is in discussing Gothic word-order. German scholars usually confine their study to cases where the Gothic word-order differs from the Greek. A concrete example will nicely illustrate the unscientific nature of this procedure. Dr. Kopptiz, in Vol. 32, page 462, of "*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*," compares the word order of the reflexive pronouns in Gothic and Greek and comes to the conclusion that the true Gothic position here was immediately *after* the verb, for wherever the Gothic differs from the Greek the reflexive follows the verb. As will be shown in detail below, the original position of the reflexive was *before* the verb, as still preserved in modern German in infinitive phrases and in subordinate clauses. Of course, this older order is still preserved in Gothic, but as it is also found in the Greek of the New Testament Dr. Koppitz fears that this position in Gothic must be due to Greek influence. Thus suspicion is cast upon *good old* Gothic and primitive Germanic, while a new construction, the position of the reflexive after the verb, which is struggling with a vigorous young life for supremacy, is represented as genuine old Gothic. There is here only one scientific procedure and that is the comparison of Gothic with the kindred tongues. Thus it will be necessary in the detailed treatment to point out the laws for the arrangement of words in the Germanic languages in order to show that Wulfila did not accidentally, in a large number of cases, conform to Germanic laws, but that he regularly did so. As Wulfila regularly conforms to Germanic laws and at the same time follows the Greek quite closely it must follow that the laws prevailing in Germanic at that time were quite similar to those in the popular Greek of the New Testament. Otherwise, he could not have written a *single* sentence without doing violence to his own native idiom, for neither of these languages had a free and loose system, but were subject to well-defined laws. These laws were even somewhat complicated, as there is abundant evidence in the language of the Gothic Bible that this period was one of a marked transi-

tional character. An older order of things was still largely in force, while at the same time a new order of things was coming in with a vigorous new life. English and Old Norse continued to develop the new life, while German, preserving much more of the old life and developing it along formal and psychological lines, gradually differentiated itself markedly from the other Germanic languages. As the Gothic was in the midst of the old and the new life the peculiar word-order of each life is clearly discernible. Now it seems to conform to modern German, now to modern English. It has the combined freedom of both languages, because it had the option of following the old laws or the new or in the same sentence proceeding now according to the old, now according to the new. Freedom in language is the absence of grammatical or functional constraint. Where grammatical function does not prescribe fixed rules words can be arranged according to the force of their meaning, but also here stress is associated with certain fixed points in the sentence, so that there is, after all, a complex system of rules. We turn now to the study of this system.

From the rich literature of recent years treating of word-order it seems now fairly probable that in original Indo-European the verb was usually at the end of a normal sentence. At least it seems quite sure that this was true in primitive Germanic. This older order of things is best preserved in "Beowulf." Even in the principal proposition the verb prefers the position at the end or near the end. However, the new tendency to shift the verb forward toward the unemphatic second or third place in the sentence, in accordance with its real importance, is everywhere in the book to be observed. This is, of course, most common in case of the light auxiliaries. The heavier, more important words gravitated toward the end of the sentence, crowding out the auxiliaries and sometimes also the verb itself. "Beowulf" probably belongs to the beginning of the eighth century and the Gothic Bible to the fourth century, but in point of word-order "Beowulf" at every turn presents very old features and presents them in such numbers that it at once becomes

apparent that the older life of the Germanic languages has here still a strong, healthy throb. At many little points, however, the greater age of the Gothic is perfectly evident and sheds light upon dim constructions in "Beowulf." Thus comparison between these two languages is especially productive of positive results. The writer does not present "Beowulf" as a fair representative of English speech in the eighth century, for it is fine poetry with a real poetic form and with real poetic feeling, and differed markedly from the ordinary prose of that time, but it is good old English, in large measure the survival of the good prose of a still older period that has been well preserved by the conservative spirit that has always dwelt in English poetry. Even today the poetic expression of "Beowulf" in large measure lives on in the best English verse and we English-speaking students can approach some of these old linguistic forms with a real feeling for their meaning. Thus the younger in years than the Gothic Bible "Beowulf" in some important places by virtue of the conservative spirit of English poetry presents some older features. The most marked one is the position of the verb at the end of the sentence. Nowhere better than in "Beowulf" can we also study the first movements of the verb toward the second and third places in the sentence. This movement was much like that of a soldier who leaves his position at the end of the line and takes a position toward the other end. He simply steps in between two other soldiers in the line. The line does not break up or lose its former physiognomy. In the following passage we find the first or oldest type: "ða hine Wedra cyn / for herebrogan habban ne mihte" (461-2) "Then the people of Wedermark could not protect him from the terror of war." Here in the oldest type the verb is at the end. In this instance it is an auxiliary. As the auxiliaries are not important they are often removed from the important end position. If in this sentence or in similar ones the auxiliary is withdrawn to some place near the beginning the infinitive is left at the end of the sentence preceded by its modifiers. This second type is very common in "Beowulf": "he mæg þær fela / freonda findan" (1837-

8) "He can find there many friends." The same force that crowded the verb out at the end of the sentence does not in "Beowulf" so easily crowd the infinitive out so that it makes way for the more important modifiers such as objects and heavy adverbs. However, this still newer type with the modifiers of the infinitive after it is also sometimes found in "Beowulf": "Wille ic asecgan suna Healfdenes, mærum þeodne, min ærende" (344-5) "I desire to tell the son of Healfdene, the distinguished king, my errand." This third type tho comparatively little used in the epic itself is undoubtedly much more common in the every-day life of the time. The poet had carefully selected the choicer older types for the body of his poem, but the familiar tones of daily life found occasional expression, for even a poet must come down to earth at times. Later this third type became the normal type for all styles of English speech.

In Gothic all three types described in the preceding paragraph are found, but the characteristic feature is the very wide use of the third type. In the "Elder Edda," in spite of the conservative power of poetic form, the third type is also widely used. The second type is also often used, but the first or oldest type is little employed and soon disappeared entirely. The early and full development of the third type in both Gothic and Old Norse seems to point to the early development of this type in East Germanic before the separation into North Germanic and Gothic. There is certainly a remarkable resemblance here between Gothic and Old Norse, and this resemblance must take away every shadow of suspicion of Greek influence at this important point. It seems to be a simple fact that the second and third types were very common in Greek, Gothic, Old Norse, and English was fast developing in the same direction. The translation of the Greek form of Matthew 10.34-5 into these three languages will show how close together these four languages really were:

μη νομίσετε ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν. ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὀνγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς
 "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came

not to send peace but a sword, for I am come to set a man against his father and a daughter against her mother and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." "Nih ahjaip̃ patei qemjau lagjan gawairpi ana airpa; ni qam lagjan gawairpi, ak hairu. Qam auk skaidan mannan wiþra attan is jah dauhtar wiþra aiþein izos jah bruþ wiþra swaihron izos" (Wulfila). Greek, English and Gothic here all employ the third type, i. e., the modifiers *after* the infinitive, but the Greek and Gothic could have chosen the second type, i. e., the modifiers *before* the infinitive. In English the development is now closed here and we could not now employ here the second type, altho in the language of "Beowulf" it would have been perfectly natural. In the Old Norse edition the second and third types alternate in this passage: "þer skulut eigi meina at eg sé kominn frið at senda á jörþina: Eigi kom eg frið at senda, heldr sverð. Því at eg em kominn at ýfa manninn í móti föðr sínum, og dótturina í gegn móður sinni, og sonar-konuna í gegn móður mannz sins (Lawman Odd's edition of 1540). The Old Norse edition might have followed here the third type thruout as in the Greek, for the second and third types are freely used in this translation. Odd seems to follow mere caprice in using the one or the other of these types. This shows clearly that Odd felt the two types as having the same force. Wulfila, on the other hand, conformed closely to the Greek. It is quite probable that in the Gothic period there was still a difference between the two types. The third type was employed to put an emphatic word at the end of the sentence: "duhwe *weis* ni mahtedum usdreiban *þana?*" (Mark 9.28.) "Why couldn't *we* cast out *that demon?*" Many interesting sentences show that there is a more lively flow of feeling in the third type. On the other hand, the occasional position of unimportant unaccented personal pronouns after the infinitive at the very end of the sentence indicates clearly that formalization had set in. As there was, however, often still a difference in both Gothic and Greek between the two types, Wulfila found it usually natural to follow here the Greek word-order. Later grammatical expression here became perfectly

rigid. English settled upon the third type and German upon the second, and the other types disappeared. In modern Icelandic the third type has not yet gained a complete victory over the second type, so that this language presents the antique feature of possessing two types.

Let us now turn to another form of expression and follow its development of types. In "Beowulf" the simple finite verb without an infinitive modifier is quite commonly at the end of the sentence with its adverbial and object modifiers grouped before it: "Ic ða ðæs wælnes, þe is wide cuð, / grimne gryreligne grundhyrde fond" (2135-6) "I then found the grim terrible guardian of the sea which is so widely known." Alongside of this first and *oldest* but still *common* type there is a younger second type in which the verb has been withdrawn from the end and placed in the second or third place so that more important modifiers might take the important positions at or near the end: "Secgas bæron/on bearm nacan beorhte frætwe, / guðsearo geatolic" (213-4) "The warriors bore into the hold of the ship the bright armors, the splendid weapons." Also in Gothic we find both of these types, but the younger type is much more common than in "Beowulf." The verb is usually not emphatic and is freely removed from the end and can assume almost any other position than the last one. The end position has become a great favorite for emphasis: "bi sunjai gudis sunus ist sa" (Matth. 27.54) "Truly *this* is the *Son* of *God*." In Gothic and the older Germanic languages this position of the demonstrative at the end has a peculiar meaning. As it is usually found at the beginning of the sentence this transposal to the uncommon end position gives it increased emphasis. The beginning of the sentence is also interesting. The phrase *bi sunjai* stands entirely outside of the structure of the sentence, as it is a mere exclamation. The first words in the sentence proper are *gudis sunus*. They have here increased emphasis because as predicate they have left their usual position in the last place and have assumed the uncommon position in the emphatic first place. Thus the sentence is double-header with

strong emphasis at both ends. This is a very common form of distributing emphasis in the older languages. Not only demonstratives but also other words can stand at the close and other words than predicates can stand at the beginning: "*managaim sparwam batizans sijuh jus*" (Matth. 10.31) "*Ye* are of more value than *many* sparrows." The strong accents in both of these sentences show clearly the characteristics of vigorous *spoken* language. The English translations of these sentences indicate plainly that modern languages have not preserved this older usage here, for we now place the demonstrative and the personal pronoun at the beginning of the sentence. Fixed formal rules have changed the language at this point. The results of this older usage are, however, still plainly visible. The old demonstrative that once stood at the end of a German sentence pointing to a following asyndetic relative clause is still preserved in modern German in the relative pronoun *der*. The history of its loss of accent, its transference to the subordinate clause, and its development into a relative pronoun is given in detail below. In the older Germanic languages in the form of an accented demonstrative it is found at the end of the principal proposition just as *sa* in the above Gothic sentence. This older picture of stirring life at the end of the principal proposition clearly points out the forces that crowded the verb out of the end position. This tendency to place the demonstrative and other emphatic words at the end and thus crowd the verb out of this position is also a common feature of New Testament Greek, and Wulfila follows here the original very closely. In these last two Gothic sentences the position of the verb varies. In the first one it stands in the second place, in the second sentence in the third place. If it is not in the last place it may assume any other position, even the first one: "*Ik im saei weitwodja bi mik silban jah weitwodeih bi mik saei sandida mik atta*" (John 8.18) "I bear witness of myself and my *father* who sent me bears witness of me." In the second proposition the subject for emphasis has been removed from the first place to the last place. This leaves the verb at the beginning of the

proposition. Early Germanic grammar did not make the position of the verb functional, i. e., it did not require the verb by virtue of its function to take a definite place. Today German grammar requires in a normal declarative sentence the verb to stand in the second place. This is mere caprice and so unnatural that it takes an Englishman or an American a lifetime to learn it, but at last after he imperfectly learns it he is comforted by the thought that it is after all a credit to a man to have difficulty in accustoming himself to such an arbitrary usage. Formerly there was great freedom here in Greek and in the Germanic languages. Thus in both Greek and Gothic there were two types here and neither one of them had become set as yet. In the new type the position of the verb had not yet become fixed or functional, and thus Wulfila had in his work of translation from the Greek a much easier task than even a modern Englishman would have, for in spite of the fact that we still have a good deal of freedom in comparison with German it is quite evident that there have become established in modern English certain fixed rules that must now be followed. It is quite plain that it was much easier for Wulfila to approach the Greek closely. The reason lies in the simple fact that there were more types at the disposal of the Gothic translator than are at our command today. Thus it seems reasonably sure that Wulfila was not straining and forcing his native speech beyond its capacity. He conformed easily to the Greek original. It can often be done in modern English, which has *one* of its most common types. It was still easier in Old English because it had *two* of the common types, and occasionally also the *third*. It was easier for Wulfila because he had at his disposal for free use *all three* of the common types found in the Greek. Wulfila's task will appear still easier when we add to the types he had at his command the very common narrative type with the verb in the first place. The moment that the events begin to stir and the story moves forward the verb takes the first place. A *large* part of the Gothic gospels is written in this lively narrative form, as they are in fact narratives. This narrative type is a marked feature of

Old English, Old Norse, and of the Greek of the New Testament. As this once common type has entirely passed away in English we cannot approach a good part of the Gothic and the Greek Testament with modern English feeling, but what is entirely foreign to us was one of Wulfila's commonest constructions. It enabled him to approach a large part of the Greek Testament with sympathetic feeling and understanding.

The general types have now been given in outline. There are, of course, very many little details in connection with these general types, for already in Wulfila's time many little rules of formal grammar were beginning to assume a certain fixedness. Some of these usages have entirely passed away and the Gothic forms of Wulfila seemed to the writer very much like evident imitations of the Greek. The comparison of these suspicious constructions with usage in Old English, Old Norse, and Old High German proved a very long and tedious study. Often weeks were consumed without a single result. At first the work was accompanied by great discouragement, as it seemed that Wulfila was after all a servile imitator of the Greek. In time this search became an intense pleasure, for every investigation ended in a vindication of the Gothic character of Wulfila's work upon the convincing testimony of such Germanic documents as the "Elder Edda," "Beowulf" and the oldest High German writings, specially Otfrid's "Ewangelienbuch," which to the writer has for years gradually increased in value as a valid witness of Germanic quality in spite of certain peculiar and marked mannerisms that at first led him to depreciate the work. The writer desires to present a few of these details here and also some particulars concerning the types discussed above in the hope that these details may supplement the general outline given above, and may also show in a still clearer light the Gothic quality of Wulfila's speech.

We often find in Gothic questions no trace of the question order which today obtains in questions. The word-order is exactly as it is in Greek, and follows one of the usual types found in declarative sentences, i. e., the oldest type with the verb at

the end and the second type with the verb in the second or third place: (oldest type): "niu jah þai þiudo þata samo taujand?" (Matth. 5:36) "Do not even the publicans the same?" (second type): "þu is sa qimanda þau (first type:) anþarizuh beidaima?" (Matth. 11.3) "Are you the one that was to come or shall we await another?" This is not a Greek construction, but older usage which did not recognize a functional word-order for questions, i. e., a particular word-order for this particular function. We find the same usage in the older Germanic languages: "Ac ðu Hroðgare / widcuðne wean wihte gebetttest, mærum ðeodne?" ("Beowulf" 1990-3) "Have you freed Hrothgar the distinguished king from his widely known misfortune?" "Hwat þu árnaþir í jótunheima?" ("Skirnismól" 41.3) "What did you do in the land of the giants?" As a survival of this older usage we still often find in modern colloquial language the normal order instead of the question order: "You're going tomorrow?" This older usage is quite limited. It can never be used today when the interrogative pronoun is in an oblique case as in the example from "Skirnismól." Once it was freely used and only slowly and gradually did the question order become functional. This question order is already found in Gothic where the Greek still uses the old types: "niu þuk sahw ik in aurtigarda miþ imma?" (John 18.26) "Did I not see you in the garden with him?" From a study of the examples in Gothic there seems to be a distinct tendency to develop the question order, but the old order of things in general prevails. As the subject is often a pronoun and the pronoun is here as elsewhere often omitted, it is often impossible to recognize the question by its form. The old types of questions in Gothic are among the most antique and quaint constructions found in the language, much more antique than in any other Germanic tongue.

One of the commonest idiomatic constructions in all the oldest Germanic languages is the placing of the verb in the first place in lively narrative. Gothic is the classical period of this construction. It abounds everywhere; it begins the moment the narrative moves forward. In lively movement it remains con-

sistently in use: "Jah atiddja dalap rign jah qemun ahwos jah waiwoun windos jah bistugqun bi þamma razna jainamma, jah ni gadraus, unte gasuliþ was ana staina" (Matth. 7.25) "And the rain descended and the floods came and the winds blew," etc. At a glance one sees that the English translators are not able to give the description the good old Germanic ring. This old construction was gradually crowded out by the formal rules that began to regulate English speech. It still remains in German in veiled form. The provisional subject *es* is placed before the verb: "Es zogen drei Bursche wohl über den Rhein." Sometimes also the old simple form is used: "War einst ein Glockengiesser / zu Breslau in der Stadt." However, in the course of the ballad here and elsewhere the old construction disappears, or if it remains at all it appears in somewhat different form. A light adverb as *da* is placed before it: "Da ruft er seinen Buben / zur Feuerwacht herein." Even this form is only in limited use. The old consistent, continuous sprightly Germanic movement is gone. The form with *da* is not a modern development, but is also very common even in Gothic: "þaruh frehun ina siponjos is," etc. (John 9.2) "His disciples asked him," etc. The force of the adverb can scarcely be brought out in a distinct shade of meaning. This form is Germanic and hence in the Gothic Bible it does not correspond closely to the Greek, but the old simple form without the adverb corresponds word for word with the Greek, but there cannot be the slightest doubt that it is idiomatic Gothic. Sometimes the Gothic uses this type where the Greek does not employ it: "þanup biþe ut usiddjedun eis, sai atberun imma mannan baudana daimonari" (Matth. 9.32) "As they went out, behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil." In this peculiar and very idiomatic Gothic sentence notice that the particle *ut*, tho written separately, is probably a part of the verb, much as a separable prefix in modern German. The separable verb is thus preceded by two temporal words, the first a temporal adverb, the second a temporal subordinating conjunction. As the subject follows the verb it is perfectly clear that the type here used is the narrative,

even tho two particles precede. Thus we have the narrative type in a subordinate clause. This use of the narrative type in a subordinate clause is also employed where it corresponds to the Greek, for it is a common construction in both languages: "Biþeh þan usþwoh fotuns ize jah nam wastjos seinos anakumbjands aftra qaþ du im" (John 13.12) "After he had washed their feet and had taken his garments and had seated himself again he said to them." The type is not as clearly marked in this sentence as in the preceding as the subject is not expressed, but the position of the verb at the beginning of each clause points plainly to this type. This seems probable because the subject in similar sentences is sometimes expressed and follows the verb as in the preceding example and also in the following sentence: "jah biþe warþ sabbato, dugann in synagoge laisjan" (Mark 6.2) "And when the Sabbath was come he began to teach in the synagogue." We must not approach such sentences with ideas of the modern German subordinate clause in mind. In Gothic there is as yet no difference between word-order in principal and subordinate clauses. The lively narrative tone has not yet received grammatical limits. In studying sentences like these one can see what modern German has lost under the tyrannical sway of hypotaxis.

In marked contrast to the word-order with the verb in the first place or in the second place preceded by a light adverb as found in lively narrative, stands the old type with the verb at the end or the new type with the verb in the second or third place, usually following the subject immediately or soon. The word-order with the verb at the beginning is employed to emphasize the idea of activity, lively forward movement, development, while the old and the new type are used for the quiet office of description, explanation, filling out little details, unfolding theories, general ideas, personal views, plans, etc. Thus in John 10.25-30, where Jesus is explaining his relation to God and man Wulfila employs either the old or new type, but in verse 31, where Jesus was interrupted by the Jews, who were about to stone him, Wulfila returns to the narrative type with the verb at the begin-

ning. The Bible abounds in such changes and they are truly characteristic of all the oldest Germanic documents. The word-order corresponds very closely to the Greek, but the same word-order is also found in "Beowulf" and is good Germanic beyond the shadow of a doubt. The contrast here between the narrative type and the new type is especially instructive. These two types of utterance do not only as wholes each convey an entirely different general impression, but each type within itself has an entirely different system of stressing individual words. The narrative form is very old, is indeed Indo-European. In this form, in accordance with a very old usage, the first word in the sentence is the most emphatic. Not only the verb can be brought forward, but any other element in the sentence can take the first place when the attention is to be especially called to it. Thus in the narrative form the attention is fixed upon the verb. Originally the narrative form was not a fixed type. It was only an accident. By mere accident it happened to be a verb that was accented. Any other word could likewise have taken the first place if it were to be made prominent. However, by the removal of the verb to the first place away from the end of the sentence, the usual place for the verb in the old type, a word-order type arose which gradually assumed peculiar meaning as a whole in contrast to the old type with the verb at the end. When the new or second type arose by the shifting of the verb toward the second or third place the narrative type was at once felt as also standing in contrast to it, for the new type was only felt as a variant of the old type. The new type with the verb in the second or third place represented a new system of placing emphasis upon individual words in the sentence, the stressing of the last word. Then there were two systems of stressing. Either the first word or the last one became prominent. These two systems were not felt as standing in contrast to one another if any other word than a verb took the first place. They simply represented different methods of making words prominent. Whenever, however, the verb assumed the first place the distinct narrative type usually asserted itself and it thus clearly

differentiated itself from the other forms of utterance. The narrative type stood in contrast to the new type with the verb in the second or third place, no matter whether this type had the emphatic words before the verb or at the end of the sentence. At this point the situation is exactly the same in Gothic and Greek and in large measure also in Old English. Later there were several marked and radical changes in the Germanic languages. In the Gothic period the question order had not yet come in conflict with the narrative order. Later the narrative order became in the other Germanic languages the question order. Narrative assumed the form of the new type with the verb in the second place, altho once the narrative form had stood in marked contrast to the new type.

The use of the two emphatic types, the emphatic word in the first or last place, is much the same in Gothic and modern German. It is remarkable how faithfully German has preserved at this point the old Germanic order of things. For especial emphasis a subject, object, adverb, or the predicate may take the first place: "*þeinai* wesun jah *mis* atgaft ins" (John 17.6) "Sie waren *dein* und du hast sie *mir* gegeben" (Luther), or nearer the original and just as idiomatic German: "*Dein* waren sie und *mir* hast du sie gegeben." "*Hardu* ist þata waurd." (John 6.60.) "Das ist eine harte Rede" (Luther), or keeping closer to the original: "*Hart* ist die Rede." Wulfilā here again translates word for word as it is in the Greek, but he has not made a less idiomatic rendering than Luther. The Goth had a livelier feeling for the exact shade of feeling in the Greek and has rendered it perfectly. Modern German can in those two examples also render the Greek word for word, but Wulfilā could do this in a large number of cases where a modern German could not follow. In Gothic the predicate or any other important word can for emphasis introduce a subordinate clause: "*þu* qipis ei *þiudans* im ik" (John 18:37) "Thou sayest that I am a *king*." Likewise in a question: "*an* nuh *þiudans* is þu?" (ib) "Are you then after all a *king*?" To be sure, two little light adverbs introduce the sentence here, but the predicate is the real begin-

ning of the sentence. In the following sentence the emphatic *subject* introduces the question: “þu is sa qimanda an *anþarizuh* beidaima?” (Matth. 11.3) “Bist *du* der da kommen soll, oder sollen wir eines *anderen* warten?” (Luther.) Here, as in Greek, the subject *þu* is emphatic in the first proposition and takes the important first place, while the object *anþarizuh* is the important word in the second proposition and stands at the beginning. The modern fixed formal rules for word-order in a question limit the use of the psychological rules for emphasis here. Gothic has much greater freedom and can follow the Greek much more closely. One common construction is even unknown to modern German, the placing of some important word between a verb and an emphatic object which introduces a sentence: “*þatuh* Abraham ni tawida (John 8.40) “*That Abraham* didn’t do.” “This did not Abraham” (King James version) “Das hat Abraham nicht getan.” The first English translation renders the Greek faithfully and also corresponds exactly to the Gothic. The English of the King James version corresponds to older English and Luther’s German. In Old English both of these forms were common, but the first form alone survives in common English. We who speak English can approach the Greek and Gothic here with our modern feeling, but the German cannot. Thus in Gothic, English and Greek both an accented object and an accented subject may be placed at the head of the sentence. There is a pause between the two heavy words. The two words are very closely related together in the chain of the thought and hence are naturally brought together in speech. The force of the thought cannot assert itself in German. The mere formal law that a verb must follow the introductory object here holds absolute sway. Wulfila deserves credit for his fine translation here. He uses here the strongest demonstrative *þatuh* instead of the usual *pata*, and this shows clearly that he caught the force of the Greek emphasis and even tried to strengthen it. The following passage with the emphasis upon the subject attracts out attention: “*atta* meins *þatei* fragaf mis maizo allaim ist” (John 10.29) “Mein *Vater*, was der mir

gegeben hat, ist mehr als alles andere." The expression seems to be popular Greek and has been rendered by colloquial German which approaches the Greek and Gothic very closely. The Gothic translation here follows a Greek version quite different from that which lay before the authors of the King James version. The Goth used an H text, the Englishmen a K text. Wulfila himself usually worked from a K text. It is possible that the original words of Wulfila were according to K and were later changed by some one who favored the H text. We shall never attain here to absolute certainty. Whether Wulfila or an interpolator is the author of this Gothic sentence, it is evidently forcible spoken Gothic, notwithstanding the close conformity to the Greek. The retention of the exact word-order here to reproduce exactly the strong accent of the original reminds us of Wulfila's usual procedure. In the preceding examples the words in the first place have been nouns, adjectives, or adverbs, but also a verb can take this position: "faurpizei Abraham waurpi *im* ik (*ἐγὼ ἐμὶ*) (John 8.58) "Ehe denn Abraham ward, bin Ich" (Luther). Luther's word-order *bin Ich* results from an *Ich*" (Luther). Luther's word-order *bin Ich* results from an entirely different force than that found in the Gothic. The German is governed by the mere formal rule that the verb must introduce the principal proposition if it is preceded by a clause. This formal rule is not in force in oldest Germanic. In Gothic the verb introduces the principal proposition because it is emphatic. In the Greek the verb is at the end in the *old* normal type. Wulfila felt the emphasis which here rests upon the verb and he did not hesitate to express it. He has heightened the effect by the use of chiasmus, a common usage in oldest Germanic. In the preceding clause the verb follows the subject, while in the principal proposition the order is reversed. In the following sentence we have a fine example of emphasis with the stressed verb in the first place: "qap izai Jesus: *usstandeiþ* broþar þeins" (John 11.23) "Jesus said unto her: Thy brother shall *rise* again." Here again, as so often elsewhere, Wulfila uses the same word-order as in the Greek because this order contained the

strong accent that the utterance demands. In this form, which is exactly like the Greek, we have an old Germanic form which existed long before the historic period. It represents an older period than that represented by the narrative form with the verb in the first place. The narrative type developed out of it and became not an expression for the emphasis of the *verb alone*, but a formal means of imparting liveliness of tone to the *whole statement*. The newer narrative form has almost disappeared, but the original construction still survives as a living force in modern German: "Es *irrt* der Mensch so lang er strebt." The verb cannot now stand as the first word, but must be preceded by *es*. In fact, however, it is the first word of real meaning. The preceding *es* distinguishes the declarative form from the question form.

In the preceding section the emphasis rests upon the words in the first place, but emphasis is also very commonly associated with the last place: swaswe kann *mik* *atta* jah *ik* kann *attan*, jah *saiwala* meina lagja faur þo *lamba* (John 10.15) "As the *Father* knoweth *me* even so know *I* the *Father*, and I lay down my *life* for the *sheep*." At a glance it will be seen that both subjects and objects can stand at the end for emphasis. In this one sentence we find both systems of accent. In one place the emphatic object *attan* stands at the end of its proposition, in another place the emphatic object *saiwala* introduces the proposition. In one place the emphatic subject *atta* stands at the end, in another place the emphatic subject *ik* stands at the beginning. This change of place on the part of the subjects i. e., chiasmus, is a favorite usage found everywhere in the oldest Germanic languages, also a favorite in the language of the Greek testament. Notice also that where the subject follows the verb for emphasis, as here in case of *atta*, the subject must leave its usual place at the head of the sentence and that this often brings the verb into the first place as here. The context will usually make it plain that this word-order with the verb in the first place is not the narrative type. This order with the verb in the first place and an emphatic subject in the last place is an especial

favorite in Gothic as well as in the other Germanic languages: "Jah *riqis* juþan warþ jah ni atiddja nauhþan du im *Jesus*" (John 6.17) "And now it was *dark* and *Jesus* hadn't come yet." There are many such examples and they all follow the Greek, but the Gothic is undoubtedly idiomatic. Wulfila employed the Greek form to bring out the Greek accents.

The most difficult and at the same time the most interesting study in Gothic word-order is that part of the sentence which contains the modifiers of the verb. This stretch lies either before the verb, as in the old type, or follows it, as in the new type. This whole stretch is hotly contested territory. No word here has an assigned place, but must earn its place. The words are arranged according to their material weight or their psychological force. The words light in form and meaning occupy the first part of this territory. The words heavy in material weight and meaning gravitate towards the end. The leading and more constant force is the psychological one, but a natural feeling for rhythm arranges the heavy words after the light ones. Of course, the feeling and thought are supreme and can assert themselves in spite of rhythmical laws. The psychological and rhythmical laws are very old and hence are found in all the older Germanic languages. The laws are practically the same in modern inflected languages as German and Icelandic. The only changes are the few formal grammatical or functional rules that have in course of time become established, such as the rule that of the two case forms, dative and accusative, the former precedes if both forms are nouns, while the latter precedes if both are personal pronouns. In English an adverb of place precedes an adverb of time, while in German just the reverse is true. These formal rules, however, are all set aside under the pressure of strong feeling or logical force. English differs somewhat from German and Icelandic here because it has lost its inflection, and prepositional phrases disturb the older order of things by virtue of their material weight. The introduction of the new type of word-order in prehistoric Germanic did not at all disturb the arrangement of words other than the verb itself. The

verb simply glided in between two other words in the line. As it was psychologically usually a light word, it gravitated toward the weakly stressed portion of the sentence following the strongly stressed beginning of the sentence. In German the verb finally became fixed in the second place by a purely grammatical law. There is, of course, some explanation for this. The verb was often very closely associated with the strongly stressed introductory adverb or object and naturally followed it, but its position here became fixed in German and is today a mere matter of form. In the oldest languages the position of the verb was very free: "Abu þus silbin þu pata qipis pau anþarai þus gepun bi mik?" (John 18.34) "Sayest thou this thing of *thyself* or did *others* tell it thee of me?" In this interesting question both types are used. In each one of the two propositions the emphatic element introduces the proposition. The initial position for emphasis is common with both of the types. In the second proposition the verb *gepun* stands in the third place. It might have stood in the last place or in the second place. It simply glided in between *us* and *bi*, because there were no pronounced rhythmical or logical reasons against it. It did not disturb the relations between *þus* and *bi mik*, which it separates. If the verb had gone elsewhere these words, *þus* and *bi mik*, would have come together and in this word-order. The personal pronoun would precede the prepositional phrase. Some who have discussed Old English and Gothic word-order have misunderstood this point. Attention has erroneously been called to the difference between the Gothic and Greek in the following passage: "ni þau weis atgebeimaþus ina" (John 18.30) οὐκ ἂν σοι παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν "Wir hätten dir ihn nicht überantwortet" (Luther). "We would not have delivered him up to thee." Here *þus* precedes *ina*, as it is less important. There is, in fact, no difference here between Greek and Gothic. The Greek has exactly the same order of these two words, it only differs in that the verb comes between the two words, just as in the preceding Gothic sentence and often elsewhere in Gothic and Old English. Its use seems largely rhythmical, and hence in two different languages, with

words of different weight, the position of the verb will sometimes be relatively different. On the other hand, as the verb is usually light in *meaning* it is in Old English and Gothic easily pushed aside: "Jah ik *libain aiweinon* giba im" (John 10.28) "And I give unto them eternal life." The Gothic in this sentence follows the Greek word for word and in Old English the Greek could have been translated literally. Altho the Gothic form is the new type the older system of emphasis has been chosen. The emphatic object follows the light pronominal subject immediately, and tho it does not take the initial position, it is the first emphatic element in the sentence. Thus the verb is crowded out of the second place. The last word in this sentence and in a large number of cases elsewhere is as here an unstressed personal pronoun or a reflexive pronoun. Of course, such light words are not put at the end, because they are emphatic. They come to stand in the last place, simply because the verb goes to a position nearer the beginning of the sentence, in accordance with formal usage in the new type. These light words are often, as in this sentence, crowded toward the end by the tendency for strongly stressed words to move toward the emphatic first place. The position of light pronouns at the end often also results from the fact that the sentence is short and there are in the sentence besides subject and verb only light pronominal objects. If the verb then goes to the beginning of the sentence the light pronouns are left at the end. Thus it is evident that the end position is not always one of prominence. In such cases we see not the influence of the end position, but merely the result of a formal type. The verb may now go to the second or third place, not because it is crowded out of the end position by heavy words, but merely because it follows mechanically the operation of formal law, which requires the verb to stand in the second or third place. Thus even in so old a language as Gothic formal laws have begun to acquire force.

In Otfred the reflexive is often found at or near the beginning of the sentence, with the verb at the end or in the second, third, or fourth place: "*sih thana uz tho fiartun*" (III 17.46)

"They then betook themselves away." In this sentence the subject is understood. There was thus nothing to keep the reflexive away from the first place. It belongs in the lightly stressed position immediately after the stressed subject, for it is the lightest word in the sentence and lightly stressed words naturally glide into the position after the stressed subject. This sentence is the first or oldest type, as the verb is at the end. In this type the reflexive often follows a light pronominal subject, because it has in this type, in large measure, become a fixed formal functional rule for it to follow the subject, even tho the subject be weakly stressed: "sie sih tho sar irhúabun" (III 15.34) "They then arose." It is interesting to observe in Otfrid the development of the new type. The verb now has left the end position, but it has not yet become fixed in the second place. It glides in between two words in the old historic order of the first or oldest type: "*Der* sih thés muaz frówon" (IV 15.6) "*That* man should be happy there (in heaven)." Aside from the verb we find here the old historic order of the oldest type. The subject is in the first place and is stressed. It is followed by the light reflexive *sih*. The lightly accented verb *muaz* has glided into the position after the stressed demonstrative *thes*. This position of the verb here suited the metrical purpose of Otfrid, but to the modern observer this placing of the verb, according to its rhythmical weight, strengthens the impression already given above that in the earlier development of the second type the position of the verb was, in large measure, regulated by rhythmical considerations. The position of the reflexive in the narrative type is also interesting. In this type the verb takes the first place or stands at the beginning after an unstressed word, so that it is often formally the second word, but in reality the first word of importance. The chief characteristic of this type is that the verb precedes the subject. In Otfrid we often find the weakly stressed reflexive before the verb in the narrative type: "sih kérent sie zi gúate" (V 6.41) "Then they turn to the good." Again the poet has evidently arranged his words to suit his measure, as formal grammatical rules did not hinder him as they

would today. The light reflexive introduces the sentence followed by the heavier verb, so that a rhythmic movement ensues. The position of the reflexive here before the verb suits the poet's measure, but this word-order is thoroughly Germanic. It may not have been the common position in the prose of the ninth century, but it is the good prose of an older period which lived on in poetry. In every one of these sentences and in many others the reflexive stands *before* the verb as in primitive Germanic. As the word-order has not yet become perfectly rigid the verb itself still often assumes various positions, according to the rhythmical requirements of the sentence. In all of these examples it still, however, stands *after* the reflexive as in the prehistoric period. Later, the position of the verb in German became rigid. It regularly assumed the second place. This rule is already in Otfrid the usual one: "Sunna irbalg sih thrato suslichero dato." (IV. 33.1) "The sun was incensed on account of such deeds." As in this sentence the reflexive became finally established in the first position *after* the verb. The subject takes the first place, the verb the second and the reflexive the weakly stressed third place. It is most interesting to observe that the old order of things, the position of the pronoun *before* the verb has been preserved in a few constructions: "*mich hungert, mich durstet.*" The *mich* here is, of course, not a reflexive, but it is like the reflexive an unstressed pronoun. This impersonal construction preserves the most antique feature in the German language—the position of an unstressed pronominal object *before* the principal verb. A pronoun may often stand before the principal verb as in "*Mich* hat er geschlagen, nicht Hans," but this construction has absolutely nothing to do with the one under consideration, for the pronoun, *mich*, is emphatic and takes its place at the head of the sentence, because it is the most prominent word in the sentence. On the other hand, in "*mich hungert*" the *mich* is entirely without stress. It takes its position at the head of the sentence, not by virtue of any modern law, but in conformity to a prehistoric law, which prescribed that modifiers of the verb should precede it. This old German impersonal con-

struction, which is also found in Gothic and is undoubtedly still older, has been preserved by a mere accident. In such sentences the verb happens to stand in the second place, so that this old order in this respect corresponds to the modern iron-clad rule for the position of the verb. The moment, however, that a modern formal subject is used the old construction disappears if the subject introduces the sentence: "*es hungert mich.*" As there are now three words in the sentence and the verb *must* stand in the second place the pronoun comes to stand in the third place, i. e., *after* the verb. This curious old construction with the pronominal object before the verb is also preserved in infinitive phrases, for modern German, like prehistoric Germanic, requires the modifiers of the infinitive to stand *before* it. It is likewise preserved in subordinate clauses, because the verb is there required to assume the last place. Thus the pronominal objects, as well as all other modifiers of the verb, come to stand before it as in a primitive Germanic sentence. In both infinitive phrases and subordinate clauses the reflexive usually stands toward the beginning. In infinitive phrases the reflexive is usually the first word, in subordinate clauses the first or second. Also in Gothic the reflexive could in exactly the same way as in Oldfrid stand either before or after the verb. As the new type had already a vigorous, strong life, the position immediately after the verb is much more common in Gothic than the position before the verb. Dr. Koppitz in "*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*," Vol. 32 page 462, thinks that in genuine Gothic the reflexive always follows the verb, for he says that it always does so when it varies from the Greek. The Gothic reflexive may, however, *precede* the verb, even where there is no corresponding construction in the Greek: "iþ hwazuh saei haifstjan sniwiþ, allis *sik gaparbaiþ*" (*ἐγκρατεύεται*) (I Cor. 9.25) "And every man who strives for the mastery is temperate in all things." There are also other examples. The testimony of other Germanic languages and the history of the different types clearly show that this is good Gothic. Dr. Koppitz also thinks that the reflexive should be connected with the verb *immediately* and sus-

pects Greek influence in the following arrangement: "ei ni qipau þus patei jap-þuk silban *mis* skula is" (Phil. 19) "Ich schweige, dass du dich selbst *mir* schuldig bist" (Luther.). In this fine rendering Luther has followed the Greek, but the idiomatic quality of his language is attested by general usage in German today. Dr. Koppitz has overlooked entirely that this order has been preserved in his own native language. This is the normal order, the accusative of a pronoun precedes the dative. Dr. Koppitz directs the attention more to *þuk*. He thinks it is separated too far from the verb. He does not see the historic relations at all. This is the old type and hence the verb is at the end. The words are arranged before it in the order of their importance, the more prominent ones nearer the end. The new type might have been used here. Then *skula is* would stand before *þuk* and the reflexive would follow the verb immediately as is the more common Gothic usage. Dr. Friedrichs, who has treated this sentence in his dissertation, "Stellung des pron. pers. im Gotischen," has misunderstood the force of *þuk*. He thinks it is emphatic here, because it is separated from the verb. He misunderstands the principle of Gothic accent. Wulfila follows uniformly the Germanic principle that the important modifiers of the verb gravitate toward the end of the sentence. Paul's thought in this passage runs thus: "I shall gladly pay you anything I may owe you on account of Onesimus. Let me pass over the fact that you owe yourself to *me*," or more briefly: "I shall pay you, but in fact you really owe *me*." The position of the verb never has the slightest influence upon the position and emphasis of objects. All thru the centuries the relative position of objects has been governed by the rule that the heavier ones gravitate toward the end. By the formation of different types the verb has changed its position, but this change of position is without influence upon the word-order of the modifiers of the verb.

Nothing gives an observer more confidence in the idiomatic quality of Wulfila's speech than his arrangement of the personal and reflexive pronouns. No other translator has rendered the

Greek pronouns so faithfully and at the same time so idiomatically. Occasionally he cannot find a similar Gothic idiom, then he does not hesitate to follow his own language as in: "jah sunus mans skamaip *sik is*" (Mark 8.38) "Des Menschen Sohn wird sich auch *seiner schämen*." Altho this translation differs entirely from the Greek, it is not a bit more idiomatic than the following fine rendering which follows the Greek very closely: "jah ik frijo ina jah gabairhtja imma *mik silban*" (John 14.21) "Ich werde ihn lieben und mich ihm offenbaren" (Luther). A careful reading of this passage will reveal that the accusative *mik silban* is more emphatic than the dative *imma* and should follow it. Usually the accusative of a pronoun *precedes* a dative, for it is less important. As this is the normal formal order here it has almost become functional and fixed in modern German. However, under live impressions the psychological law that requires the emphatic word to follow asserts itself and we can say: "Ich werde ihn lieben und ihm *mich selbst* offenbaren." The order of the objects in this modern German sentence is that of Wulfila and his Greek original. Luther has translated by a careless normal form and has overlooked the emphasis. Wulfila has made here a better rendering, but perhaps it was much easier for him to do this, as Gothic was not so completely under the sway of formal rules as modern German. Wulfila naturally followed the psychological law. He sometimes even doesn't hesitate to correct a little slip in the Greek in the arrangement of words: "at-uh-þan-gaf sa lewjands *im bandwon*" (κόσμησον αὐτοῖς) (Mark 14.44) "And the betrayer had given them a sign." A dative of a personal pronoun in both Testament Greek and Gothic should precede a noun, for it is usually lighter in material weight and logical force. Wulfila sometimes adds little rhetorical flourishes that are not found in the Greek original: "Jah gawaurkjam hlijans þrins, þus ainana jah Mose ainana jah ainana Helijin" (Mark 9.5). "Let us make three tabernacles, one for thee and one for Moses, and one for Elias." Look at the rhythmical arrangement of the words here! The pronoun *þus* precedes the heavier pronoun *ainana*. For the sake

of the parallelism the same order is preserved in the next words, *Mose ainana*, but in the next pair the order is reversed, i. e., Wulfila takes liberties with the text and embellishes the language by the use of chiasmus, which is especially appropriate at this point by virtue of the greater heaviness of the noun, *Helijin*. That sounds like spoken language rather than a clumsy translation!

A number of misconceptions with regard to the relation of Gothic to Greek have arisen thru a misunderstanding of the origin and development of the Gothic relative pronoun *saei* and the real meaning of this form in the time of Wulfila. Professor Streitberg, on page 233 of his "Gotisches Elementarbuch," says: "Der relative Charakter der Konjunktion *patei* tritt nicht nur darin hervor, dass sie fast durchweg nach Verben steht, die den Akkusativ regieren, sondern auch in der vereinzelt erscheinenden attraktion." Professor Streitberg is evidently laboring under the delusion that the conjunction *patei* is derived from the relative pronoun *patei*. He also expresses his belief in the erroneous theory of attraction. On the same page of his book he also remarks: "In mechanischer Nachahmung des griechischen Vorbilds erscheint mitunter *patei* wie *ὅτι* vor direkter Rede." Again he sees in *patei* relative force and regards its uses as a mechanical imitation of the Greek. Often elsewhere he simply follows the Greek in judging of the nature and force of the demonstrative forms ending in *ei*. If the Gothic forms represent Greek relative forms it seems to him that they must be relatives. These statements throw false light not only upon the relations of Gothic to Greek, but also the relation of Gothic to the kindred Germanic languages. These erroneous conceptions affect not merely a few isolated passages, but a large part of the Gothic Bible. As important interests are thus involved here the writer in order to set these matters in the proper light desires to lay before his readers

GEORGE O. CURME.

Northwestern University.

(To be continued.)